

I will miss Minnie Minoso. He is a lesson in why sport are bigger than runs, hits, and errors. It is about human beings and humanity and young kids.

Thank you, Minnie.

REST IN PEACE, FATHER TED HESBURGH AND PROFESSOR CHARLES RICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Notre Dame family lost two larger-than-life figures.

One, a Holy Cross priest, Father Ted Hesburgh, served as Notre Dame's president for 35 years and oversaw remarkable growth of the university named for Our Lady. Father Hesburgh was known and recognized around the world.

The other was a layman, Charles Rice, who taught at Notre Dame Law School for 40 years and was a retired Marine, a devoted husband to his wife, Mary, without whom he could never have accomplished his work, a devoted father, and an academic who dove deep into the philosophical underpinnings of the law. It is estimated that he taught half of the living alumni of the Notre Dame Law School.

While much has been written and said these last few days about Father Hesburgh, given the international stage on which he walked, comparatively less has been said of Professor Rice, except for the recognition that countless law students, colleagues, and pro-life and religious liberty advocates have given in the days since he passed away.

To my left is one of those iconic figures from the 1960s. In it, we see Dr. Martin Luther King and Father Hesburgh, standing together for racial equality in Chicago.

What allowed these two remarkable men to come together, in spite of different backgrounds and traditions, was a common understanding of justice that was grounded in our Western and Judeo-Christian philosophy of law.

It was this same philosophy that was at the heart of what Professor Charles Rice taught at Notre Dame.

In Martin Luther King's "Letter from Birmingham Jail," written 2 years prior to the famous Selma March that will be commemorated this weekend, Dr. King addressed his fellow clergymen, many of whom were criticizing his tactics in confronting unjust Jim Crow laws.

One may well ask, Dr. King wrote: "How can you advocate breaking some laws and obeying others?"

The answer lies in the fact that there are two types of laws, just and unjust.

I would be the first to advocate obeying just laws. One has not only a legal but a moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to obey unjust laws. I, Dr.

King said, would agree with St. Augustine that "an unjust law is no law at all."

Dr. King then asked, Now what is the difference between the two? How does one determine whether a law is just or unjust?

King answered that a just law is a manmade code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas, Dr. King continued, an unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law.

These words would be very familiar to any of Charlie Rice's jurisprudence students. Indeed, a significant amount of Professor Rice's work dealt with the concept of natural law.

Natural law principles were recognized in our Declaration of Independence, with Jefferson referencing the "Laws of Nature and Nature's God" and the recognition that individuals are endowed by a Creator with certain inalienable rights, including a right to life.

Charlie Rice was a fierce defender of the right to life. He believed that every human being, whether an elderly grandmother who could no longer care for herself, a young adult who was incapacitated through an accident or a degenerative disease, an unborn child capable of feeling pain, or a 3-week-old unborn child whose heart had just begun to beat, had an inalienable right to life. And for Charlie, those lives, and all human lives, are sacred because they are a gift of God.

In the years since *Roe v. Wade*, Professor Rice never wavered from his core conviction on the right to life. He became increasingly concerned for the religious freedom and conscience rights of individuals when he saw government coercing them into practices that violated those rights.

Professor Rice told his students: "Never be afraid to speak the truth." He certainly never was.

For him, the truth was clear. The right to life and freedom of religion, both of which are specifically mentioned in our Nation's founding documents, are under attack.

But Professor Rice never gave up. He believed that one day those rights would be protected again, and he continued to defend those rights to the day he died.

His work in defending life and religious freedom will continue. It will live on in his wife, Mary, his children, and grandchildren, as well as the countless lives he touched.

May Professor Rice and Father Hesburgh rest in peace.

PRIME MINISTER BINYAMIN NETANYAHU'S RECENT ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 23 hours ago, in this Chamber, Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu was given a large megaphone to undercut American diplomatic attempts at restraining Iran's nuclear ambitions. One has to go back to the days of Gen. Douglas MacArthur being fired by President Truman, who was then invited to Congress by the Republican leadership to a rapturous audience.

Yet history has shown that General MacArthur and the Republican leadership were wrong, Truman was right, and is, deemed one of our best Presidents for the hard, difficult decisions he made to much political criticism. And history has not been so kind to the career and personality of General MacArthur and the message he delivered to that Congress.

I suspect that history will not be kind to yesterday's speech and the decision to stage it.

The Prime Minister delivered no alternative vision other than an impossible set of demands that would ensure negotiations by America, our allies, and the Russians fail. He seemed to doom Americans and Iranians to be permanent enemies, even though the Iranian people, distinct from the ayatollahs and their minions, by all accounts, are the only country in the region, other than Israel, that has a positive view towards America. Think about that.

But the flaws in Netanyahu's speech were more fundamental. He had no alternative vision, no outline of a plan that would do anything other than lead to war.

□ 1030

His remarks continued a series of dire predictions that I have heard from him since I first came to Congress in 1995. He had the same certitude when he testified before Congress about what a positive, transformational event it would be for the United States to go to war with Iraq.

It was good politics at the time, probably even for most American politicians, and I am sure it was good politics in Israel. But he demonstrated spectacularly bad political judgment, cheerleading the United States into the worst foreign policy disaster in our history, costing us trillions of dollars with no end in sight, costing hundreds of thousands of lives, and casting the Middle East in turmoil.

Indeed, Iran's ayatollahs were the only winners in the wake of that tragic war urged on by Netanyahu. It allowed Iran to have an outsized influence in the very countries that Netanyahu mentioned. The Middle East is in crisis, on the defensive with ISIS forces that are only slightly larger than the authorized strength of the California National Guard.

Mr. Netanyahu produced a vision that is bound to fail, and at what cost to the American-Israeli leadership? Making Israel a partisan issue harms Israel, according to a good friend of